

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of A.K., Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

JOHN C. KURZAWA,

Respondent-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED

June 12, 2001

No. 228335

Benzie Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 98-000217-NA

Before: Neff, P.J., and Doctoroff and Wilder, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Respondent appeals as of right the family court order terminating his parental rights to the minor child pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(f), (g) and (h); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(f), (g) and (h). We affirm.

Only one statutory ground is required to terminate parental rights. *In re Huisman*, 230 Mich App 372, 384-385; 584 NW2d 349 (1998), overruled in part on other grounds, *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 352-353, n 10; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). The family court did not clearly err in finding that termination was warranted under either subsection 3(g) or 3(h), on the basis of respondent's extended incarceration, his lack of support for or communication with the child over a period of more than three years, and his belated minimal efforts to become involved in the child's care and custody. Further, the family court did not abuse its discretion in denying respondent's motion for rehearing because respondent failed to show "palpable error" by which the court and the parties were misled and that correction of the error must result in a different disposition. MCR 2.229(F)(3); *Churchman v Rickerson*, 240 Mich App 223, 233; 611 NW2d 333 (2000).

Respondent was not denied the effective assistance of counsel because counsel's performance did not fall below an objective standard of reasonableness and moreover, respondent was not prejudiced. *People v Pickens*, 446 Mich 298, 302-303; 521 NW2d 797 (1994). The family court found that termination was proper even after hearing testimony from respondent's mother concerning possible temporary placement of the minor child with her.

Respondent has failed to sufficiently brief his claim that the proceedings below were unfair nor has he cited proper authority for this claim. “Insufficiently briefed issues are deemed abandoned on appeal.” *Etefia v Credit Technologies, Inc*, ___ Mich App ___; ___ NW2d ___ (Docket No. 216166, issued 4/27/01), slip op, p 3. Regardless, we find this claim without merit. Respondent had ample opportunity over the course of four years to present his case against termination.

Affirmed.

/s/ Janet T. Neff
/s/ Martin M. Doctoroff
/s/ Kurtis T. Wilder